

## EVALUATION

### 1. What were the strengths of the day?

- The interactive activities and the facilitation process that moved the agenda.
- Information on No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and President's Commission.
- Facilitation – Lots of work - great flow.
- The work that had been done in advance of the meeting - the presentations and handouts.
- Liked working collaboratively with others, sharing ideas and learning from others.
- Work that was done in preparation for meeting (handouts, web page) was very helpful and added to the day's productivity.
- Appreciated Dr. Parker attending the whole day.
- Pre-planning evident.
- Kept on tacks, but with flexibility.
- Everything today was wonderful - I enjoyed evaluations and outcomes section.
- Process.
- Organized - well thought out.
- The Power Point overview - especially NCLB and President's Commission.
- The table discussions.
- Terrific process - knowledgeable and proactive.
- Possibility, activities will create a better way.
- Discussion of Task Force priorities.
- Table discussions regarding special education services in their area.
- PowerPoint presentation on NCLB.
- Small group discussions and reporting out.
- Mixture of group composition (helps to get to know others in large group).
- The introductory information on NCLB (Alice's presentation).
- Presentation of updates of SELPA Directors' template.
- Presentation on background information.
- Great facilitator – Glad that some one has a focus on the outcome.
- Cumulative knowledge in group representing a variety of expertise.
- Well thought out agenda covering multiple subjects.
- Speakers were awesome.
- Collaborative effort and participation of all members of the group.
- Overview presentations.
- Great team members.
- Collaborative thinking on priority areas.
- Overview of NCLB/Commission.
- Participant knowledge and skill of facilitator to keep things on track.
- Judy moved things along well.
- Nice breaking up the work with presentations by individuals and parents.
- Collaborative efforts of so many dynamic folks made for a very productive day!

- List of websites mentioned.
- Meeting was well orchestrated with lots of information to support our activities.

2. What could have changed to improve the meeting?

- Introduction of members to the whole group, not just at the table.
- If all members attended - there were three missing from one table.
- Coffee.
- Maybe more time to ensure we get through it all.
- Nothing.
- Make sure the technology is working.
- Nothing - it went well, except for the technology.
- Please provide list of acronyms with definitions.
- Nothing
- Review of past meeting should be done by participants prior to the meeting - could have used this time for other items.
- Additional time in the a.m. (when we are fresher) to review the IEPs from other states.
- Nothing – There is a lot of ground to cover and it's exhausting.
- More information on President's Commission recommendations.
- More time to get to all priority areas.
- We could have divided the priorities work between the groups so that all groups weren't working on the same things (The it was caused a lot of duplication).
- The six priorities were not well written which reflects on the work of the June meeting probably.
- More time - any chance we can do a couple of 2-day meetings. It feels like more time would produce more results.

3. Comments related to your preferred involvement in the work of the IEP Task Force?

- State SELPA IEP template and further definition of educational benefit.
- How family groups and professional groups can collaborate and work together.
- Professional and parent groups working together.
- Want to do whatever is needed to make this happen!
- I like the small and large group format.
- Work with the template.
- Work with the concept of bringing general education teachers "into the loop".
- Work with the training component.
- I am enjoying the involvement.
- Really enjoy the collaboration/sharing of perspectives.
- May need to bring in additional stakeholders to Task Force meetings (i.e., transition - Department of Rehabilitation, Center for Independent Living, etc.).
- Hope to contribute to the legal issues (e.g., how educational benefit has been determined).
- Good group discussions.

- Am committed to working with the group on this task. As an administrator, I am interested in additional funding and a streamlined IEP process.

4. Other comments related to the work of the IEP Task Force.

- Didn't attend first meeting and haven't seen this addressed.
- Assessment component of the IEP process - feel that we need to train IEP team participants in how to use assessments to write goals and determine placement.
- In one year, we may need to have "homework" in between meetings.
- I enjoyed NCLB by Alice Parker.
- I liked everyone's flexibility
- Information on the website is helpful.
- Much needed - I think you are headed in the right direction.
- I hope we will see something truly tangible at the end.
- Lots of work in preparation/handouts.
- I think the people we represent are looking for paperwork reduction - think that we are moving in a different direction.
- Based on my interests and expertise, I would be interested in working on the following IEP Task Force priorities or activities.
- Increased knowledge on what already exists.
- Continued updates on NCLB/2042/AB 1907 would be helpful.
- I feel confident about the final products that this group will be generating.
- Overall great efforts/strides by the group in establishing priority areas to address.
- Task Force seems dedicated and competent.
- I would like to see input from the CDE waiver office prior to finalizing any IEP form(s) due to their role in approval of waivers.
- I feel we are on the right track with the issues identified. Some will be easier to resolve than others, but the ideas from this group and the consensus on almost all issues was amazing.
- I really hope that actual changes take place as a result of our work.

5. Based on my interests and expertise, I would be interested in working on the following IEP Task Force priorities or activities.

- Priority Issue #1: Lack of Consistency Across the State in IEP Template and Process
1. Pamela Ptacek
  2. Maureen Burness
  3. Yolanda Cruz
  4. Craig Nelson
  5. Sue Kawasaki.
  6. Dale Spears
  7. Irene Elliott
  8. Dale Mentink

- Priority Issue #2: Time and Money
1. Maureen Burness
  2. Sandra Pope
- Priority Issue #3: Coordination of Services/Agencies
1. Juno Duenos
  2. Marlyn Pino-Jones
  3. Janet Balcom
  4. Dale Mentink
  5. Jim Coulter
- Priority Issue #4: Transition Planning – Between Levels and at the Secondary Level
1. Sandra Pope
  2. Felicia Bessent
  3. Vicki Benson
  4. Dale Mentink
- Priority Issue #5: Lack of Training for Parents, Teachers, Administrators and School Staff
1. Juno Duenos
  2. Craig Nelson
  3. Sue Kawasaki
  4. Terri Atad
  5. Dale Spears
  6. Vicki Benson
  7. Janet Balcom
  8. Debbie Baehler – Handbook of Goals and Objectives – Training revision and/or input.
- Priority Issue #6: Clear, Articulate List of Appropriate Accommodations/Modifications that are Listed by Specific Disability (menu of strategies for teachers to tie to the regular classroom)
1. Sue Kawasaki
  2. Irene Elliott
  3. Dale Mentink
- Other:
1. Assessments aligned to standards and strategies to improve teaching and learning – Diane Youtsey
  2. Input to “educational benefit” – Terri Atad.
  3. To adequately choose a priority or activity, it would be helpful to see these listed – Bruce Little.